



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

"there are many sentimental solutions offered for the salvation of Europe. There is a political solution offered us in the League of Nations. There is no machinery for dealing with investments. What is needed is an international board capable of handling the economic problems facing the world."

From conversations with another government official the following points stand out: Notwithstanding the dismemberment of the old Austria-Hungarian Empire, Vienna will always retain its importance as a transportation and commercial center. As a matter of geography, all the important railroad lines north and south, as well as east and west, converge at or radiate from Vienna. No political situation can change the fact that Vienna is the gateway to the East. This official, himself an engineer, cannot conceive it possible that the traffic of the channel ports and the Baltic en route to the Black Sea and southeastern Europe can ever be diverted from Vienna by the building of new railway lines. Nor is it likely, he believes, that new lines of railroad will be built to handle the traffic from the Galician oil fields or from the immense coal fields of upper Silesia and the Ostrau-Karwin district in Czechoslovakia which now moves over the double-track railway system from those great producing centers to and through Vienna. Nor is it probable that another line of railway will be built to compete with the double track of the Southern Railway from Vienna to Trieste, with its well-constructed branch line to Yugoslavia, to Hungary, and to Italy. The topography of the country is such that the great railroad lines from west to east must pass through Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Sofia, and Constantinople to the southeast, and Vienna and Budapest to the east and northeast. Vienna has all the facilities for handling the traffic. Furthermore, Vienna is an important river port. The transshipment from rail to river, and *vice versa*, in 1912 was 1,460,000 metric tons. The port is excellently equipped for both locomotive and stationary cranes for transferring freight from cars to barges and steamers, and the most important inland navigation company in central Europe has its headquarters in Vienna. The excellent port facilities attract traffic from the interior for the territory served by the lower Danube, and the most excellent railway facilities bring to Vienna return traffic from the agricultural country between Budapest and the mouth of the river. The transshipment of the traffic in the port of Vienna was increasing at the rate of about 10 per cent per year when the war came. British business men have purchased a large interest in the Danube River shipping, and the return of normal conditions is all that is needed to revive the river traffic and to increase the importance of Vienna.

## SIGNS AND PORTENTS IN THE FAR EAST

But for the occupation of the front pages of the newspapers in the last month or so by the catastrophe in the Near East, more and adequate attention probably would have been paid to the events of the Far East.

In September the conference at Changchun between representatives of Japan, Soviet Russia, and the Far Eastern

Republic (the Chita Government), which is under the control, it generally is believed, of the Soviet Government, collapsed because, on the surface of things, the Soviet agents flatly refused to accede to Japan's demand for indemnity by Russia for the massacre of 700 Japanese at Nikolaevsk. When that demand went down, there also went down the negotiations looking to trade arrangements between Japan and the Far Eastern Republic.

## EVENTS IN CHINA

While that was happening the eyes of the great powers were fixed carefully on China. There have been hints from there of developments that might be very important and that might cause disturbances before all of the plans in the making were carried to completion or reached a state of recognized failure.

Brief messages from China indicated that General Wu-Pei-Fu, now the dominant military chieftain of the land, and Dr. Sun Yat Sen, the leader of the South China Republic, were continuing their negotiations looking toward the establishment of a strong and stable government for all of China. That may presage complications of one sort and another. Also, there have been reports of the development of an anti-foreign sentiment, from which Americans suffered with the nationals of other lands.

Some significance was attached, therefore, to the announcement that the American position in China was to be strengthened by the dispatch of Gen. William D. Connor to command the American military contingent in China, with headquarters in Tientsin, and the appointment of Edward Bell, who has been chief of the Bureau of Current Information in the State Department, to the post of counselor of the American legation in Peking.

## CHARGES AND COUNTER-CHARGES

Reverting to the collapse of the tripartite negotiations at Changchun, there was an immediate exchange of charges and counter-charges between representatives in Washington of Japan and the Far Eastern Republic. Japan challenged the good faith of the Far Eastern Republic and of Soviet Russia, but at the same time renewed her promise that she would withdraw her troops from continental Siberia, in accordance with promises made in the Washington Conference and prior thereto.

It is worthy of note that United States Senator Ovington E. Weller, of Maryland, who returned early in October from a five months' trip to the Orient with the Naval Academy Class of '81, of which he is president, stated publicly, when he reached Washington, that his observations convinced him that Japan would take her troops out of continental Siberia, out of China, and ultimately out of the Sakhalin Island; and in fact, on September 29, a dispatch came from Tokio to the effect that the Japanese had withdrawn both troops and civil authority from the Siberian mainland opposite Sakhalin Island.

The Japanese statement, issued in Washington on September 27, following the collapse of the Changchun Conference, came from the embassy and is as follows:

## THE JAPANESE STATEMENT

The failure of the Changchun Conference is a matter of deep regret to the Japanese Government, but it means no change in our policy of withdrawing our troops from Siberia. Withdrawal from Vladivostok and from other mainland points will be conducted by the end of October.

As for Sakhalin, our retirement from the northern or Russian half of the island will take place, as repeatedly stated, as soon as the Nikolaievsk affair has been settled. The Japanese Government has no territorial design whatever in this or any other connection.

The Japanese Government has been earnestly striving to adjust relations between the Japanese and Siberian peoples as well as with other countries, and it certainly cannot be said that we have failed to show a liberal and conciliatory policy.

#### LIKE DIFFICULTIES AT GENOA

With what I believed to be a very clear understanding, our delegates met the representatives of the Chita and Soviet governments at Changchun; but hardly had the conference opened before it became evident that our delegation was to meet difficulties of the same character in dealing with the Moscow representatives as the European nations had met recently at Genoa and The Hague.

It was made clear in advance that we sought working arrangements with the Chita Government which would protect our frontiers from lawless incursions and terminate hostile propaganda and give protection to the Japanese and Koreans residing lawfully in Siberia. We hoped to obtain recognition of the rights of private ownership of property for our people and freedom to trade and conduct their affairs, and these things, we believed, would benefit the unfortunate Russians in Siberia as well as the approximately 10,000 Japanese and Koreans who still reside and attempt to conduct their business there by right of treaty with the former Government of Russia.

#### ASKED TO LET TROOPS STAY

We had been led to believe that the Chita Government also wished to conclude such an arrangement, and that it understood clearly that occupation of the northern half of the Island of Sakhalin would not be discussed except in connection with a consideration of the Nikolaievsk massacre, in which over 700 Japanese, including the consul, had been massacred under circumstances of a particularly brutal character.

In order to demonstrate Japan's good faith, the Japanese Government ordered and actually began the withdrawal of Japanese troops from Siberian towns. Various groups of Russians, as well as Japanese, petitioned our government not to withdraw the troops, fearing the development of lawlessness and warfare among Russian factions as well as against Japanese; but in spite of such possibilities the Japanese Government, determined to give no further reason for criticism or suspicion of Japan's policy, decided to continue the withdrawal.

In view of the fact that the Moscow Government, whose representatives at Changchun immediately assumed the dominant position over that of China representatives, has persistently denied the right of private ownership of property in European Russia, the Japanese Government cannot but doubt the sincerity of the Soviet's intentions at Changchun and their willingness to enter into an agreement to terminate propaganda.

However, the Japanese Government, in accordance with the wishes of the Japanese people, deeply sympathize with the afflicted Russian people and profoundly desire that peace and order may be maintained in Siberia.

#### THE FAR EASTERN REPUBLIC'S REPLY

The reply made on behalf of the Far Eastern Republic came from Boris Sevirskey, acting chairman of his country's special trade commission to the United States. It follows:

The Changchun Conference between the Far Eastern Republic, Soviet Russia, and Japan failed because the Japanese insisted on retaining the Russian half of the Island of Sakhalin. The representatives of the Far Eastern Republic and of Soviet Russia requested the Japanese to set the date for the withdrawal of Japanese troops from Sakhalin. The Japanese refused to set such date and replied that they were holding Sakhalin until such time as they received compensation for the death of 700 Japanese in Nikolaievsk.

#### INSIST ON EVACUATION

The Russian delegates insisted that Sakhalin must be evacuated unconditionally, just as the rest of the Russian territory, and there cannot be any legal, moral, or any other justification for the Japanese holding Sakhalin for the Nikolaievsk events, in which, besides 700 Japanese, 4,000 Russians were killed as a result of disorders due to the anarchy created in Nikolaievsk, as well as everywhere in Siberia, by the Japanese militarists.

The statement of the Japanese Embassy in Washington, quoting the Foreign Minister of Japan, Mr. Uchida, says that the Japanese will live up to their promise to withdraw their troops from Vladivostok and other points on the mainland before the end of October. Let us hope that this is so.

The people of Siberia, who had four years of Japanese military occupation, and whom Mr. Uchida calls "unfortunate," will rejoice with the rest of the world when the last Japanese soldier leaves Russian soil.

#### FORESEE MORE BLOODSHED

The Japanese statement that various groups of Russians and Japanese had petitioned the Japanese Government not to withdraw their troops from Siberia may be a forerunner of more bloody events in the Russian Far East. The "Russians" who may be petitioning the Japanese to keep their troops on Russian soil are no doubt led by the Japanese-owned bandit Semenoff and his friends, whom the Japanese have been using as their tools for creating trouble in Siberia.

During the Darien Conference, when the Japanese were negotiating a settlement with the Far Eastern Republic, these bandits, armed by the Japanese, started a new war and captured Khabarovsk. They failed because of the united resistance of the local Russian population.

During the Changchun Conference the Japanese broke faith once more and turned over Russian arms, of which they were custodians, to their latest tool, the Czarist General Dietericks, who has already started the butchery of Russian men and women.

#### TELLS WHY JAPAN IS DISPLEASED

The Japanese are displeased that the Far Eastern Republic is supported by the rest of Russia and her 130,000,000 population. Of course, they would prefer to deal with the Far Eastern Republic alone, because she has only 2,000,000 inhabitants, scattered over a million square miles.

The Japanese statement about the denial of the rights of private property to the Japanese is just as sincere as the rest of the Japanese declarations. On the Island of Sakhalin and along the seacoast the Japanese seized private property of the Russian citizens without any legal justification, and they are holding it to this day.

The Russian people will stand united in the defense of their sovereign rights and in their demand that Japanese troops leave every bit of Russian territory occupied by them, and hope that the American people will sympathize with them in their struggle against foreign aggression.

### THE NEAR EAST'S THREATENING DISASTER

In the period between the first ten days of September and the first ten days of October, the war in the Near East, between Greece and Turkey, assumed proportions that for a time threatened the peace of all Europe in the gravest way, perhaps, since the signing of the armistice in the World War, on November 11, 1918.

The Turks smashed the Greek armies, captured and devastated Smyrna, and seemed about to overrun the Straits region, and to start a conflagration that would end no man knew where. They put a terrific new tax upon the already overstrained relations between France and Great Britain; they set in motion forces that led to the abdication of King